

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain pending in the application. Independent Claims 1, 7, 15 and 21 are proposed to be amended for reasons discussed below. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and do not introduce issues requiring additional consideration or search (all issues were included in February 3, 2005 *Remarks*), entry of the Amendment after final rejection is respectfully requested.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Preliminary Matters

- The acceptability of the formal drawings was not affirmatively indicated.
- The February 3, 2005 IDS was apparently not considered.

Note: Additional IDSs were submitted on August 23, 2005 and August 25, 2005.

- The Correspondence Address was not updated.
- The Attorney Docket Number was not amended.

Applicants request that these matters be attended to.

The June 15, 2005 final Office Action

In the Office Action dated June 15, 2005, the examiner maintained and finalized a rejection of Claims 1-25 based on a combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,453 (Romans *et al.*) and U.S. Patent No. 6,567,416 (Chuah).

Applicant thanks the examiner for clarifying the basis of the rejection, on pages 9-10 of the June 15, 2004 Office Action (missing pages were faxed to Applicants' representative on August 15, 2005).

Applicant continues to assert the allowability of the claims as originally filed, but amends the claims to more clearly describe certain features that were present in the original claims and argued for in Applicants' February 3, 2005 *Remarks*, which are *incorporated herein by reference* as being applicable to the amended claims.

Preliminarily, Applicants explain that text relating to a superframe with a CP and CFP is merely moved from the end of the paragraph to the beginning. Also, the content of the contention control (CC) frame has been broken down into two sub-paragraphs so that the structure of the frame is more apparent. These two changes are made purely for purposes of clarifying format, and should not affect the substance of the case.

Of more substantive focus is the amendment of independent Claims 1, 7, 15 and 21 to change the “reservation request (RR)” to be an **RR non-data frame**. The amended language emphasizes a feature discussed at length in Applicants’ February 3, 2005 *Remarks*. In particular, the new language emphatically distinguishes Applicants’ RR *non-data* (control) frames from Romans’ FIG. 4 “uplink slots.” Romans’ uplink slots may contain *data*, or *data plus Control Point Service (CPS) Request messages*,¹ but in any event Romans’ uplink slots do not constitute “RR *non-data* frames” as now specifically claimed. On this basis alone, independent Claims 1, 7, 15 and 21 should be allowed.

Moreover, the last three paragraphs of Claim 1 recite a multipoll frame, a downlink frame the precedes uplink *data* frames that occupy transmission opportunities (TOs) (see left half of Applicants’ FIG. 10). The multipoll frame and ensuing TOs concern *data*, while the CC frame and CCOs concern *control* (now specifically claimed as *non-data* frames).

The last three sentences of part 3 of the June 15, 2005 Office Action refer to portions of the Romans *et al.* patent that concern changing a node’s slot in a TDMA transmission scheme. Applicant interprets the Romans *et al.* patent to imply that a node does not appear to be able simultaneously to occupy plural Transmission Opportunities (TOs). In any event, while the Office Action is vague in this regard, Applicants submit that changing a node’s slot in a TDMA scheme does not suggest the claimed multipoll scheme, especially in a claim in which data frame TOs are so clearly differentiated from RR control frames in CCOs.

The comments concerning multipoll frames are applicable not only to independent Claim 1, but also to dependent Claims 8-9, 16-17 and 22 which depend from independent Claims 7, 15 and 21, respectively.

The foregoing remarks demonstrate that Claims 1, 7, 15, and 21, and therefore all their dependent claims, are patentably distinguishable for a variety of reasons over the references,

¹ Romans *et al.*; column 6, line 67; column 7, lines 6-7, 20, 27, 33, 40, 50-52.


considered either individually or in combination. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections have been complied with, properly traversed, or rendered moot. Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for allowance. Should any questions arise, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative so that this case may receive an early Notice of Allowance.

Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Date: September 12, 2005
For Customer No. 26,652
Telephone: 301.464.0431

Raymond C. Glenny
Registration No. 32,413